

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/044,628	01/10/2002	Joseph C. Rapuano	17561-069	8607	
75	90 06/21/2004		EXAMINER		
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,			GOFF II, JOHN L		
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C. One Financial Center			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Boston, MA 0			1733		

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•				UM
,	Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/044	,628	RAPUANO ET AL.	Ü
Office Action Summa	<i>ry</i> Examir	ıer	Art Unit	
	John L.		1733	
The MAILING DATE of this co Period for Reply	mmunication appears on	the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	S
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COM - Extensions of time may be available under the prafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the lift the period for reply specified above is less than lif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum of Failure to reply within the set or extended period any reply received by the Office later than three rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	MUNICATION. by sisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no is communication. thirty (30) days, a reply within the s mum statutory period will apply and for reply will, by statute, cause the s nonths after the mailing date of this	event, however, may a reply l statutory minimum of thirty (30 d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABAND	be timely filed)) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this commun ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	iication.
Status				
 Responsive to communication This action is FINAL. Since this application is in conclosed in accordance with the 	2b)⊡ This action is dition for allowance exce	s non-final. ept for formal matters,	•	its is
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending ir 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-21 and 23-25</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>10 and 22</u> is/are obje 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to	_ is/are withdrawn from is/are rejected.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 10 Janu Applicant may not request that an Replacement drawing sheet(s) inc 11)☐ The oath or declaration is object.	uary 2002 is/are: a)⊠ are yobjection to the drawing(soluding the correction is req	s) be held in abeyance. uired if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	. ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
·	e of: riority documents have b riority documents have b opies of the priority docu rnational Bureau (PCT F	een received. een received in Appli ments have been rec Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Ma	mary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)	l

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is in response to the amendment received 3/31/04.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 1 requires forming a lay-up comprising placing a layer of protective-carrier sheeting between two layers of conductive-foil followed by covering each of the conductive-foil layers with a dielectric layer. Claim 1 further requires stacking a plurality of the lay-ups to form a book. It is noted that while claim 1 is an original claim disclosing forming a book from a plurality of lay-ups wherein adjacent dielectric layers of each lay-up meet, e.g. two stacked lay-ups comprise dielectric-foil-carrier-foil-dielectric-dieclectric-foil-carrier-foil-dielectric, it is unclear where in the specification this embodiment is disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 13, 14, 17-20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent 5,853,528).

Maeda et al. disclose a method for producing a plurality of circuit boards in a single pressing step wherein each circuit board lay-up is separated by protective-carrier sheets. Maeda

Art Unit: 1733

et al. teach forming (without bonding) a circuit board lay-up comprising providing a first conductive-foil (e.g. copper foil) layer extended from a first conductive-foil roll, placing a dielectric layer (e.g. prepreg) on the first conductive-foil layer, covering the dielectric layer with a second conductive-foil layer extended from a second conductive-foil roll, and covering the second conductive-foil layer with a cut layer of protective-carrier sheeting (e.g. aluminum) (Column 1, lines 19-23 and Column 2, lines 65-67 and Column 3, lines 1-9 and Column 9, lines 24-27, 32-34, 46, and 66-67 and Column 10, lines 1-7 and Column 11, lines 38-39 and 42-53). Maeda et al. further teach assembling a plurality of the lay-ups into a book and pressing the book in a press to from a plurality of circuit boards (Column 11, lines 66-67 and Column 12, lines 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1733

6. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Vomberg (U.S. Patent 6,158,492).

Vomberg discloses a method for producing a plurality of circuit boards in a single pressing step wherein each circuit board lay-up is separated by protective-carrier sheets. Vomberg teaches forming (without bonding) a circuit board lay-up comprising providing a cut protective-carrier sheet, sandwiching the protective-carrier sheet between two layers of conductive-foil (e.g. copper foil) extended from conductive-foil rolls, cutting each layer of conductive-foil to separate the conductive-foil layer from the conductive-foil roll, and covering at least one of the conductive-foil layers with a dielectric layer (e.g. prepreg) (Column 1, lines 14-16 and 38-40 and Column 3, lines 20-28 and Column 4, lines 10-30). Vomberg further teaches assembling a plurality of the lay-ups into a book and pressing the book in a press to from a plurality of circuit boards (Column 3, lines 28-29 and 61-64). It is noted Vomberg does not specifically recite covering both of the conductive-foil layers with a dielectric layer. However, Vomberg teaches "A gripper carriage 15b connected to the gripper carriage 15a takes one core plate 1 or set of core plates 1 at a time from a transfer station 16 associated with the core-plate conveyor 4 and deposits the core plate 1 or set of core plates 1 on the covered press plate 2." Thus, it appears when Vomberg suggests placing a set of core plates, i.e. dielectric layers, on the covered press plate, i.e. the conductive-foil covered protective-carrier sheets, that it is intrinsic to Vomberg that both sides of the covered press plate are covered with core plates. In any event, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to cover one or both of the conductive-foils layers taught by Vomberg with dielectric layers

Art Unit: 1733

depending upon the desired properties of the product produced, e.g. thickness, as only the expected results would be achieved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vomberg as applied to claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 25 above, and further in view of Pedretti (WO 00/16596).

Vomberg as applied above teaches all of the limitations of claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 12 except for a specific teaching of the material for the protective-carrier sheets. However, Vomberg is not limited to any particular material, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use as the protective-carrier sheets taught by Vomberg any well known and conventional material such as aluminum as aluminum protective-carrier sheets were well-known in the art as less complex and costly protective-carrier sheeting as shown for example by Pedretti.

Pedretti is exemplary of well known and conventional aluminum protective-carrier sheeting in the same art and for the same use as in Vomberg wherein the aluminum sheeting is supplied to the process on a roll having a thickness of 0.2-0.8 mm having the advantage of being less complex and costly than other protective-carrier sheet materials (Figure 1 and Page 2, lines 2-3 and Page 7, lines 3-5). It is noted the method of Pedretti bonds the aluminum protective-carrier sheeting to the conductive-foil layers. However, Pedretti is cited only for its showing of the well known technique of using aluminum protective sheeting supplied to the process on a roll

Art Unit: 1733

having the claimed thickness, and the primary reference Vomberg shows placing the conductivefoil layers on protective-carrier sheeting without bonding.

8. Claims 15, 16, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. as applied to claims 13, 14, 17-20, and 24 above, and further in view of Pedretti (Pedretti is described in full detail above).

Maeda et al. as applied above teaches all of the limitations of claims 15, 16, 21, and 23 except for a specific teaching of the particulars of the aluminum protective-carrier sheets, e.g. how the sheets are supplied and their thickness. However, Maeda et al. are not limited to any particular thickness or supplying method, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use as the protective-carrier sheets taught by Maeda et al. any well known and conventional aluminum protective-carrier sheets such as those shown for example by Pedretti as only the expected results would be achieved as Pedretti is from the same art as Maeda et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 9. Claims 10 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

 The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a method for producing a printed wiring board including the steps of providing a conductive-foil layer and a protective-carrier sheet from the

Art Unit: 1733

same roll wherein the conductive-foil layer and protective-carrier sheet are not "bonded", i.e. attached in any way.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-21, and 23-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is noted amended claim 1 now excludes any bonding of the conductive-foil layers, protective-carrier sheeting, or dielectric layer prior to pressing such that all previous rejections are withdrawn and new rejections are made above.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **John L. Goff** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1216**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:15 AM - 3:45 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John L. Goff June 17, 2004

YOU IN

JEFF W. AFFERGUT PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300